

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-24 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 19, 20 and 24 are amended.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 14, 18-20 and 24 are independent.

In section 5 on pages 2-3, the Office Action rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for the specified reasons. This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

As recited in claim 1, the word “at” means “during.” Thus, the phrase “at a point separate from” means “not during.” Page 6 of the specification is also amended as proposed during the personal interview.

Examiner Yuen and Primary Examiner Hsu are thanked for agreeing during the personal interview held March 12, 2008, that this rejection will be withdrawn based on the clarification provided above, and the amendment to page 6 of the specification. Examiner Yuen and Primary Examiner Hsu are further thanked for memorializing this agreement in the Interview Summary form.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

In section 8 on pages 3-9, the Office Action rejects claims 1, 16, 19 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,115,356 to Kalkunte, et al. (hereinafter “Kalkunte”) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0032827 to Hill, et al. (hereinafter “Hill”). This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

In sections 2 and 3 on page 2, the Office Action concedes that the arguments traversing Kalkunte in Applicant's October 16, 2007, Request for Reconsideration, would be persuasive were the basis for those arguments more explicitly recited in the rejected claims. Accordingly, claims 1, 6, 19 and 24 are amended to more explicitly recite the basis for the traversal arguments contained in the October 16, 2007, Request for Reconsideration.

Examiner Yuen and Primary Examiner Hsu are thanked for agreeing during the March 12, 2008, personal interview that these amendments overcome the rejection. Examiner Yuen and Primary Examiner Hsu are further thanked for memorializing this agreement in the Interview Summary form. The amendments made to claims 1, 6, 19 and 24 herein are identical to the amendments proposed during the March 12, 2008, personal interview.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1, 6, 19 and 24 as allegedly being unpatentable over Kalkunte in view of Hill be withdrawn.

Allowable claims 2, 7 and 20, from which allowable claims 3-5, 8-13 and 21-23 depend, respectively, are rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of base claims 1, 6 and 19, from which they previously depended directly, respectively. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that allowable claims 2-5, 7-13 and 20-23 be allowed.

CONCLUSION

While we believe that the instant amendment places the application in condition for allowance, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully

requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

In the event that the fees submitted prove to be insufficient in connection with the filing of this paper, please charge our Deposit Account Number 50-0578 and please credit any excess fees to such Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,
KRAMER & AMADO, P.C.



Terry W. Kramer
Registration No.: 41,541

Date: April 9, 2008

KRAMER & AMADO, P.C.
1725 Duke Street, Suite 240
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone: 703-519-9801
Fax: 703-519-9802